

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to entry of the present Amendment, claims 18-25 were pending, and claims 1-17 were previously cancelled. In the present Amendment, claims 18 and 21-25 are amended, and claims 19-20 are cancelled without prejudice. No new matter is added.

Examiner's Interview

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's time and consideration during the Interview held on December 2, 2008. During the Interview, Applicants' representative and Examiner Ciric discussed proposed amended claims 18-19 and 21-25, and the Examiner suggested further amendments to clarify the claim language and to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112, second paragraph. Applicants' representative also presented reasons that the claims overcome the cited prior art (U.S. Patent No. 6,899,162 ("Hohl")). However, as discussed in the Examiner's Interview Summary and below in more detail, agreement was not reached on the claims.

Oath/Declaration

The Examiner indicated that the Declaration filed on April 9, 2008 is defective. A new Declaration, correcting the deficiencies noted by the Examiner, has been executed by the inventors and is submitted herewith.

Abstract of the Disclosure

The Examiner objected to the amended Abstract for the reasons set forth in paragraph 6 of the Office action. The Abstract has been further amended as required. Applicants request withdrawal of the objection to the Abstract.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 19-23 and 25 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form. Claims 19-20 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 21-23 and 25 have been amended to depend from independent claims 18 and 24, respectively.

The Examiner objected to claims 18 and 24 for minor informalities. Claims 18 and 24 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the claims.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §101 for the reasons set forth in paragraph 11 of the Office action. Claim 24 has been amended to recite the acts of the method and as suggested by the Examiner during the Interview. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 24 is drawn to statutory subject matter and request reconsideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected claims 18 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

With respect to claim 18, the Examiner contends that it is not clear which disclosed elements correspond to the “means for transferring said waste heat from said at least one component to said coolant in said coolant circuit”. The claim has been amended to claim “means for transferring said waste heat from said heat exchanger (20) to said coolant in said coolant circuit” and further amended as suggested by the Examiner during the Interview.

During the Interview, the Examiner suggested that the structure readable on the “means for transferring” be identified. Applicants point to, for example, paragraphs [0015] and [0016] which discuss integration of the heat transfer medium 20 of an air conditioner into the heat cycle of the engine 10. As discussed during the Interview, Applicants note that the structure of the “means for transferring” includes, for example, various components, lines, valves, etc. which integrate the heat transfer medium 20 into the heat cycle of the engine 10 such that the waste heat of the heat transfer medium 20 is transferred to the coolant in the coolant circuit. Applicants respectfully submit that the structure of the “means for transferring” is disclosed in the specification in a way that one skilled in the art will understand what structure will perform the recited function.

With respect to claim 24, as mentioned above, the claim has been amended to recite the acts of the method and as suggested by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18 and 24 are definite and respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 18-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. ("Hohl"). Reconsideration of the prior art rejections is respectfully requested.

As discussed during the Interview, Hohl does not teach or suggest, among other things, a heat exchanger (20), the heat exchanger (20) being a source of waste heat, the heat exchanger (20) being operatively associated with an air conditioner of the vehicle, and transferring the waste heat from the heat exchanger (20) to coolant in a coolant circuit.

For at least this independent reason, Hohl does not teach or suggest the subject matter defined by amended independent claim 18 or by amended independent claim 24. Accordingly, independent claims 18 and 24 are allowable. Dependent claims 21-23 and 25 depend from independent claims 18 and 24, respectively, and are allowable for at least the same and other independent reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, entry of the Present Amendment and allowance of claims 18 and 21-25 are respectfully requested.

If additional consultation with Applicants' attorney will further prosecution, the undersigned is available during normal business hours at the below-identified telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward R. Lawson Jr./

Edward R. Lawson Jr.
Reg. No. 41,931

Docket No. 022862-1054-00 (formerly 081276-1054-00)
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Suite 3300
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108
414.271.6560

T:\CLIENTA\022862\1054\A3001466.0